

Appl. No. 09/997,513

Amendment dated October 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed on August 17, 2004, by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner rejected claims 1-24. Claims 1, 5, and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-24 remain pending in this patent application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 5 was objected to because the word "first" in the term "said first database" did not have an antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended claim 5 and have deleted the word "first". Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action states that claims 1-4, 6, 8-18, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,540 issued to Sonti et al. ("Sonti") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,162 issued to Gentry ("Gentry").

The Office Action alleges that Sonti teaches the elements of independent claim 1, except for a personal HLR not located with the telecommunication service provider and a link to an OSS of the telecommunication service provider for obtaining services. Additionally, the Office Action alleges that Sonti teaches the elements of independent claim 13, except for a processor means including the HLR, said processor means operating independent of the telecommunications service provider and said processor means coupled to said telecommunications service provider for communication and the elements of independent claim 21, except for an HLR processor within a particular user and said service provider coupled to said processor means, said network HLR pointing to said personal HLR. The Office Action further alleges that Gentry teaches the aforementioned deficiencies of Sonti. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Appl. No. 09/997,513

Amendment dated October 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

Sonti teaches a method for allowing subscribers of a telecommunications network to change easily between sets of desired features where a user dials a special code to change a profile containing different set of features for different users of the mobile station or for different times of day or geographic areas. Gentry teaches a method and system for provisioning a wireless component over an internet protocol network where a request to modify information in a location register is received from an input device coupled to an internet protocol network, the request is converted into an HLR access message, the HLR access message is sent to the location register, and information is modified in the location register in response to the HLR access message. However, nowhere do Sonti or Gentry disclose a personal home locator register located in a processor of a user, as recited in newly amended claim 1 and independent claim 21. Additionally, nowhere is there any mention of a processor means including the home location register, said processor means operating independent of the telecommunication service provider and located with a particular subscriber, as recited in claim 13. In fact, the Office Action alleges that Sonti teaches a user having access to an HLR function (which contains a processor), but admits that Sonti "does not limit the scope/design of the patent by dictating where certain hardware is located and/or how it must be connected." Moreover, Gentry does not mention any processor.

The Examiner is well aware that the three necessary criteria for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness include 1) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings, 2) a reasonable expectation of success, and 3) the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Accordingly, as Sonti and Gentry fail to disclose, either explicitly or inherently, at least the above-noted elements of claims 1, 13, and 21 and the Examiner has failed to provide such an explicit or inherent disclosure of this element, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims and the claims that depend therefrom is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

Appl. No. 09/997,513

Amendment dated October 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

The Office Action states that claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Sonti and Gentry and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,301 to Daniels ("Daniels").

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 19 depends from claim 13. Accordingly, these claims rely on the arguments presented above. Additionally, Daniels does not make up for the deficiencies of Sonti and Gentry. Namely, nowhere does Daniels disclose a personal home locator register located in a processor of a user, as recited in newly amended claim 1. Additionally, nowhere is there any mention of a processor means including the home location register, said processor means operating independent of the telecommunication service provider and located with a particular subscriber, as recited in claim 13. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 5 and 19 is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

The Office Action states that claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Sonti and Gentry and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,232 to Sistanizadeh ("Sistanizadeh").

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and relies on the arguments presented above. Additionally, Sistanizadeh does not make up for the deficiencies of Sonti and Gentry. Namely, nowhere does Sistanizadeh disclose a personal home locator register located in a processor of a user, as recited in newly amended claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 7 is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

The Office Action states that claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Sonti and Gentry and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,468 to Gallant ("Gallant").

Claim 24 depends from claim 21 and relies on the arguments presented above. Additionally, Gallant does not make up for the deficiencies of Sonti and Gentry. Specifically, Gallant does not disclose a personal home locator register located in a processor of a user, as

Appl. No. 09/997,513

Amendment dated October 20, 2004

Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

recited in independent claim 21. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 24 is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the objection and the rejections under 35 USC §103 have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorneys at 480-385-5060.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for any extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2117 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.

Dated: October 20, 2004

By: 

Cindy H. Kwacala

Reg. No. 47,667

(480) 385-5060